

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-15, and 18 are pending in this application after this amendment. Claims 16-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter included therein. New claim 18 is presented for consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been added by the addition of new claim 18. Based on the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the title and objected to claim 4. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-3, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parulski et al. (USP 7,038,714) (hereinafter "Parulski"); rejected claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski; and rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski in view of Shindo et al. (USP 6,693,665). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner did not assert prior art against claim 5. As the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections are overcome by this amendment, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner indicate claim 5 as allowable.

Objection to Title

The Examiner objected to the title asserting it is not descriptive. By this amendment, Applicants have amended the title to recite:

Browsing System Including a Camera for Browsing a Server Via an Operation Screen

Based on this amendment, Applicants respectfully request the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 15 asserting there is no adequate description in the specification that is directed to the printer notifying a user, at the print order reception apparatus of a print charge and time necessary for printing.

The specification recites on page 40, lines 8-20, as follows:

In the above embodiment, the digital camera 1 and the printer 2 are connected to each other for direct printing. However, the present invention is applicable to the case where a print order is placed by connecting the digital camera 1 to a print order reception apparatus installed in a DPE store. In this case, the print order reception apparatus functions as a server, and operation screens similar to those for the printer 2 are displayed on the digital camera 1. The apparatus receives the image data sets selected by the user from the digital camera 1 and sends the image data sets to a printer connected thereto. In this manner, printing can be carried out. **The print order reception apparatus may display a printing charge and time necessary for printing, for notification to the user.**

Applicants have amended claims 14 and 15 to recite the print order reception apparatus notifying the user of the print charge time and time necessary for printing.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 11 asserting that there is insufficient enablement in the specification to support the logo being used as an operation component for operating the printer as content to be browsed. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit that the Examiner is taking an unduly broad interpretation of the claim language. However, by this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 17 asserting the claim element recited in the claims is described in the specification as being performed by an image server. Applicants have canceled these claims and have added new independent claim 18.

Based on these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 asserting there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the server” recited in the claims. By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 10 to correct the antecedent error. Based on these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claim 1 asserting Parulski discloses all of the claim elements. Specifically, the Examiner asserts in the Official Action on page 7 as follows:

Additionally, Parulski discloses that the digital camera (electronic camera, 300) includes ... operation means for receiving an instruction used for operating the printer (the user selects an operation using the printer controls, which is inherently sent to the camera for display by the camera display, thus the printer interface (322) would inherently receive the instruction for operating the printer via the operation screen).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of this reference.

The disclosure of Parulski is directed to a printing system and method having a digital printer that uses a digital camera image display. Parulski seeks to provide a system that includes a printer GUI that allows images to be easily selected for printing without requiring that both the printer and the camera include an expensive color image display (col. 1, lines 56-60).

Fig. 4 depicts printer user controls located at the printer. The printer user controls 430 and color LCD image display 332 provide the printer graphical user interface (printer GUI) (col. 5, lines 43-45).

The printer GUI is used to control printer 400. Figs. 6A-6J depict GUI screens which are displayed on the color LCD image display 332 of the camera. As described in col. 6, lines 1-58, the user may view the GUI screens depicted in Figs. 6A-6J and make selections using the printer control buttons at the printer.

In contrast, claim 1 clearly provides for the digital camera comprising browsing means for browsing the content, a display screen for displaying the operation screen as the content to be browsed, and **operation means for receiving an instruction to operate the printer via the operation screen**. Applicants respectfully submit that there is insufficient disclosure in Parulski directed to operation means at the camera for receiving an instruction used for operating the printer via the operation screen.

The Examiner appears to assert that because the camera displays the GUI screens, that the camera would necessarily receive the instructions input at the printer controls. Applicants submit that the Examiner is taking an overly broad interpretation of the claim language. However, by this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims clarifying that the printer operates based on the instruction received by the operation means of the digital camera. As such, even if the Examiner's assertion was true, the printer of Parulski would not operate based on the instruction received at the camera.

Further, it is not inherent that the camera of Parulski would receive the instruction. The camera may only receive instruction to update the screen displayed on the LCD from the printer GUI controlled by the printer. Applicants submit that this teaching is insufficient to anticipate operation means for receiving an instruction to operate the printer via the operation screen.

Still further, the printer GUI is insufficient to teach or suggest the printer providing to the digital camera **the operation screen comprising only an image including the operation component as the content to be browsed**, wherein the operation component comprises at least one of: a button for selecting an operation command included in the operation screen, characters

comprising the operation command, and a mark indicating an active area used in the case of a touch panel.

The printer GUI of Parulski appears to be a combination of firmware stored both at the printer and at the camera. However, claim 1 clearly requires that the operation screen includes only an image including the operation component as the content to be browsed. As such, Parulski fails to anticipate these claim elements and thus, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Parulski. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9-10, 12 and 14 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on allowable claim 1. Further, as independent claims 11 and 18 include these claim elements, Parulski fails to anticipate claims 11 and 18, together with claims dependent thereon, for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 10/762,547
Amendment dated January 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 25, 2007

Docket No.: 2091-0308P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

✓ By 
Marc S. Weiner #52327
Registration No.: 32,181
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant